

# MONTREAL Homœopathic Record

DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF HOMŒOPATHY AND OF THE MONTREAL  
HOMŒOPATHIC HOSPITAL.

Vol. II. No. 4.

MONTREAL, APRIL, 1897.

25cts. A YEAR.

## Montreal Homœopathic Record

— PUBLISHED MONTHLY —

By the Woman's Auxiliary of the Montreal  
Homœopathic Hospital.

All matters of business and subscriptions to be sent  
to C. S. De Witt, care of Montreal Homœopathic Hos-  
pital, 44 McGill College Avenue.

All manuscripts, news items, etc., should be address-  
ed to Dr. Arthur D. Patton, care of Hospital.

### APPENDICITIS.

TO CUT OR NOT TO CUT, THAT IS THE  
QUESTION!

The introduction of the use of anæsthetics and anti-septics in the practice of modern surgery has given the surgeons of our day an amount of success which in many cases has led to audacity. When a few years ago it was discovered that man was possessed of a useless little attachment called an appendix, the surgeon saw no reason why it should not be cut off, particularly as it had a fashion of taking up little foreign bodies on their passage through the system, and setting up in itself and surrounding tissues a disagreeable condition of inflammation. Cut it off said the surgeon, and thus get rid not only of the present, but of possible future trouble. And so for a time almost every case of appendicitis went to the operating table. But the fatal results were so marked that thoughtful physicians began to ask what was the need of so much surgery in a trouble which hitherto had been treated medicinally with most favorable results, and it was soon shown that homœopathic

physicians were treating the disease successfully with rare appeals to the necessity of the knife. Doctor Mitchell of Chicago, reported in illustration of this fact, his own experience. He had treated 92 cases, all of them successfully, only three of which were operated on. Some little time ago *Life*, New York's witty comic paper, took up the question with the view to showing the absurdity of so much "knifing" in the treatment of this trouble, and was promptly sat upon by the *New England Medical Journal* for its presumption. The following summing up by *Life* in its issue of March 10th shows how creditably the comic journal comes out in its discussion of this very serious question.

#### HOM. OR AL.

The *New England Medical Monthly*, in answer to a statement in *Life's* columns, asks:

By the way, does *Life* really know of any surgeon who removes the appendix on general principles?

*Life* does.

Dr. —, of New York, than whom no allopath in this city is oftener named in this connection, advocates the removal of the appendix from children when fifteen days old.

Dr. —, one of the most swollen of swell old-school doctors in this city, was recently operating before students. He was at work in the abdominal cavity. Coming to the appendix, he said: "This is of no use to the patient; it may be of harm. While we are here we might as well remove it, and insure against future trouble." It was perfectly healthy. He removed it.

Our esteemed contemporary then quotes us—for our demolition, of course: "The joke of it is that during all this reign of blood and terror the homœo-